United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.23

General Assembly
Fiftieth session

Official Records

First Committee

23rd Meeting
Thursday, 16 November 1995, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: At this meeting the Committee will proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters: cluster 1, draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2; cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34; and cluster 10, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43.

On draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 in cluster 11, which we agreed yesterday to take up today, I have just been informed that the programme budget implications are not yet ready but that the draft resolution could be taken up this afternoon. With the consent of the Committee I should like to propose that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 be taken up this afternoon.

It was so agreed.

The Chairman: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolutions in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions. Are there any delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions?

There seem to be none.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions or votes on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. Laptsenak (Belarus) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have asked to speak in order to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, entitled "Contribution to nuclear disarmament".

The fate of nuclear disarmament is a responsibility and a cause for all States, large and small, nuclear and non-nuclear, since the position of all States and their attitude to, participation in, and implementation of the commitments undertaken under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are of fundamental importance for the achievement of the ultimate goal, the elimination of nuclear weapons.

We welcome the adherence of new States to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which took place after the conclusion of the work of the First Committee at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly. The role of Belarus, Kazakstan and Ukraine, along with the other nuclear States, is well known as providing practical impetus to the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Equally important is the contribution made by Belarus, Kazakstan and Ukraine in ensuring the entry into force of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. This was eloquently attested to by the support which those States have received from the international community.

95-86640 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

In dealing with the most important elements I should like to emphasize that the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, entitled "Contribution to nuclear disarmament", constructively emphasizes the importance of the efforts of all countries in the cause of nuclear disarmament and the achievement of the ultimate goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, and gives a positive impetus to further measures in this area.

Speaking as a co-sponsor of this draft resolution, we are counting on its adoption without a vote.

Mr. Fouathia (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has asked to speak to express its views on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

My delegation has always supported efforts to achieve the praiseworthy objective of nuclear disarmament. In speaking today concerning draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, Algeria wishes to reaffirm its support for this objective. It wishes to do so particularly in the present circumstances, which are marked by the end of the East-West confrontation, which should, we believe, lead to a series of measures conducive to the emergence of a more secure world for all people, a world in which security will no longer be selective in nature.

By this draft resolution the non-aligned countries are seeking to give voice to a long-held wish, namely our desire for nuclear disarmament under a new aspect, thanks to the new dynamics resulting from the end of the cold war.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, despite all the criticism that that disarmament Treaty has had and continues to have because of its obvious imperfections — was none the less extended at the Review Conference. We believe that the draft resolution before the Committee today makes it possible for us to reiterate our support for the spirit that reigned when the Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended. It is designed to improve the Treaty by giving new encouragement to efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament by eliminating nuclear weapons according to a specific timetable.

By joining the other sponsors of the initiative my delegation is indicating its support for the vision recently described by the non-aligned countries at their Eleventh Summit, held in Cartagena de Indias, Colombia. Our sponsorship of the draft resolution also reflects our concept of nuclear disarmament, which must be universal in scope, and non-discriminatory in its effects. Nuclear disarmament must, we believe, lead to a release of the tremendous resources that have been used for this purpose but are none the less needed for the promotion of the fundamental right of all human beings to life and a decent existence, free of fear.

This must be a milestone on the way towards ensuring collective security, thereby enabling us to return to the nuclear-weapons-free world that existed before 1945. Was that not the objective set by the United Nations in 1945 in its first resolution on nuclear weapons? Was that not the objective that we reiterated in 1978 at the first special session devoted to disarmament?

Mr. Kanjanasoon (Thailand): My delegation wishes to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". We wish to inform this meeting that we are convinced that the adoption of this draft resolution, together with its three main components — namely the appeal to nuclear-weapon States to stop immediately the qualitative improvement, development, stockpiling and production of nuclear warheads and their delivery systems; the call to these States to undertake step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat within a time-bound framework; and the call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament — will be an important step forward towards the strengthening of international efforts to ensure the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

For this reason Thailand decided to become one of the many co-sponsors of the draft resolution. We render our full support to the draft and we hope that all other delegations will do the same.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to speak quite briefly on behalf of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and state that while draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", was not submitted by the Movement as such, it none the less has the broad support of the States members of the Movement, including my own.

We are convinced that, as indicated in this draft resolution, with the end of the cold war and the beginning of this new era, the time is now opportune for all nuclear-weapon States to carry out effective nuclear disarmament measures with a view to the total elimination of these weapons within a time-bound framework. So they must undertake gradually to reduce the nuclear threat and

successively reduce nuclear weapons in a well-balanced and progressive way.

Effective measures of nuclear disarmament must be adopted with a view to the total elimination of these weapons within a time-bound framework.

In both the preambular and the operative parts the draft resolution contains a mandate emanating from the Cartagena Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, calling on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee to commence negotiations early in 1996 on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

Finally, and this is a mandate I have received from the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, I should like to call upon the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement to give their fullest support to this draft resolution.

Mr. Moher (Canada): I should like to speak briefly this morning to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15, "Prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". I am speaking on behalf of the 48 sponsors of this draft resolution.

Canada circulated the initial draft of this draft resolution widely very early on in the work of the Committee and invited comments thereon. In doing so we made our objectives very clear. We wanted a procedural draft resolution which encouraged the continuation of the process already initiated in the Conference on Disarmament. We also wished to avoid substance because we realized that this is a very complex and difficult issue to negotiate.

In moving forward with the draft resolution we agreed to some suggestions and were obviously open to more. I must emphasize that we appreciate sincerely the efforts made by all delegations to find a basis for a compromise on this draft resolution.

It is therefore with considerable regret that I have to inform the Committee that we have not been able to resolve all aspects of the questions that were raised during our discussions. Before concluding my comments, I should like to emphasize also our very deep appreciation to the 48 delegations that were prepared to endorse and to co-sponsor the draft resolution that we put forward in A/C.1/50/L.15.

However, as a result of the situation that I have described I must this morning inform the Committee that Canada, on behalf of the co-sponsors, is withdrawing A/C.1/50/L.15 from further consideration by the Committee at this session.

The Chairman: I am sure that representatives will have taken note of the fact that the representative of Canada has withdrawn draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to make a technical clarification with regard to the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42, on transparency in armaments. Is this the proper time to do so?

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on a point of order.

Mr. Mubarak (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is not merely a point of order. I should like to point out that we did not get the Arabic interpretation when the representative of Canada was speaking.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for drawing our attention to that fact. Do you have the Arabic interpretation now?

Let me just say once again that Canada has withdrawn draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15.

I apologize to the representative of Argentina. He may now continue.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina)(*interpretation from Spanish*): I was merely seeking clarification on a technical matter regarding the voting on the draft resolution on transparency in armaments. Should I do this at another time?

The Chairman: I would suggest that the representative of Argentina raise this technical issue at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina)(*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to make a brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament". The draft resolution, which was initiated by the delegation of

Myanmar and further developed by some interested delegations, enjoys the support of an overwhelming number of members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, including my own as a co-sponsor.

In my delegation's view, the draft resolution is one of a few important draft resolutions before the First Committee at this session, one that is timely and one that corresponds to real needs and requirements. We hope that at this session of the General Assembly the larger international community, in particular the Conference on Disarmament, will welcome the recommendations made in the draft resolution, and we hope that the Conference can agree at its 1996 session to establish an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to commence negotiations. We also call upon all members of the First Committee to support the draft resolution.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): The name of Mauritius was omitted in the reissue of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1. I would request that the name of Mauritius be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

Turning briefly to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 itself, I should like to stress that the draft resolution is the only resolution that addresses the question of nuclear disarmament in the most comprehensive and substantive manner. It reflects the commitment of the international community to nuclear disarmament and the aspirations of the peoples of the world for a world free of nuclear weapons.

As the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has already indicated, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 enjoys the support of all the members of the Movement, although it cannot be submitted as a Non-Aligned draft resolution. Actually, support for the draft resolution extends well beyond the Non-Aligned Movement. I therefore urge all members of the First Committee to give overwhelming support to the draft resolution and to vote in favour of it.

The Chairman: The Secretariat has taken note of the omission of Mauritius from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I should like to say a few words with regard to the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15, which was submitted by the delegations of Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar and Pakistan and which were contained in document A/C.1/50/L.57. We appreciate the efforts of Canada and the other co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15 to put forward an agreed draft resolution at this session on the issue of fissile material. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15 did touch on some substantive aspects of the subject.

As is well known, there are divergences within the Conference on Disarmament, specifically with respect to the scope of the treaty. My delegation and others have made serious efforts to reflect the genuine consensus in the consultations that were held at this session. Unfortunately, those efforts were not successful, and the six co-sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.1/50/L.57 were obliged to put forward those suggestions.

Now that we have heard the decision of Canada and the co-sponsors to withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15, the co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.57 will also withdraw their amendments to that draft resolution.

The Chairman: We take note of the fact that the representative of Pakistan has informed us, on behalf of the co-sponsors, that the amendments contained in document A/C.1/50/L.57 are being withdrawn.

I now call upon delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I should like to explain the forthcoming negative vote by the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament". We will vote against that draft resolution because we read it as a creative but dishonest and destructive attempt to rewrite history.

The draft resolution takes selective quotes from earlier international documents and strings them together in a way that suggests that nuclear-weapon States have indeed undertaken commitments that they have not undertaken.

Particularly acrobatic is the tactic of selecting some of those particles or morsels from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons itself and from final documents that issued from the NPT Review and Extension Conference, which took place last May. But in doing so, the draft resolution very carefully avoids any reference whatsoever to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The draft resolution would also have the General Assembly call upon the Conference on Disarmament to

undertake negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament has been unable to do things that it has agreed to do because of the actions undertaken by the prime movers of this draft resolution.

If the proponents of the prestidigitation think they are advancing their own cause and the cause of nuclear disarmament by this draft resolution, they are mistaken. They are setting it back. I would urge all delegations to think about the real interests of the international community and not try to play games with a document that issued from a summit meeting of a small group and substitute words from that final document for agreed international treaties.

The Chairman: There are no further speakers in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 1, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the Committee's 18th meeting on 10 November 1995. It was sponsored by the following States: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Malaysia, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belarus, Benin, Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Japan, Kazakstan, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted by 99 votes to 39, with 15 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, "Contribution to nuclear disarmament", which was introduced by the representative of Ukraine at the Committee's 21st meeting on 15 November 1995. The draft resolution is sponsored by Belarus, Bangladesh, Ukraine, Australia, Monaco and the Marshall Islands. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1. China has consistently advocated the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons. In achieving that goal, the Chinese Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Qian Qichen, speaking at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly, stated that the Chinese Government:

> "holds that a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons should be concluded in the same way as the conventions banning all biological and chemical weapons...under which all nuclear Powers should undertake the obligation to destroy all their nuclear weapons under effective international supervision". (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings, 8th meeting, p. 10*)

He also put forward a series of comprehensive and related nuclear-disarmament proposals.

On the basis of that position, China supports the purposes and objectives of the draft resolution. In our view, concrete steps for nuclear disarmament might be negotiated within the framework of a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, countries that possess the largest and most sophisticated nuclear arsenals have special responsibilities and primary obligations. Of course, in our view some of the provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 might also be improved upon.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation supported the adoption, without a vote, of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2: "Contribution to nuclear disarmament", which reflects the positive developments in the field of nuclear disarmament that have taken place recently.

We feel obliged to note, however, that the references in operative paragraph 5 to the voluntary renunciation of nuclear weapons have no bearing on the substance of the issue of the possession of nuclear weapons by the former USSR. As we have noted on numerous occasions, following the collapse of the USSR the number of nuclear-weapon States did not change.

Mr. Richards (New Zealand): New Zealand abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament". It might be thought surprising that New Zealand, with its well-known active support for nuclear disarmament, both politically and in practical terms in negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, should see fit to abstain on such a subject. It is, however, not so surprising when one studies the actual text of the draft resolution.

I do not want to waste the Committee's time by repeating remarks I made on behalf of New Zealand when explaining our abstention yesterday on another draft resolution dealing with a nuclear topic. Many of the arguments I used then are equally applicable to this explanation of vote.

To be helpful to the process of nuclear disarmament, draft resolutions submitted to the international community should have a balanced view of the circumstances they are covering. To do otherwise is to impose difficulties on many members of the Committee who, by their presence here, show themselves committed in good faith to the goals of nuclear and other disarmament.

It is not balanced to ignore the extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which is one of the seminal events of the international community's efforts to control nuclear weapons, and it is not balanced to take no account of the need for urgency in completing a comprehensive test-ban treaty, which will be another major milestone on our way.

It is for these reasons, coupled with some of the points made yesterday, that New Zealand has found this text unhelpful and has accordingly recorded an abstention.

Mr. Starr (Australia): Australia abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1. As we have said previously in this Committee, Australia is firmly committed to a systematic process of nuclear disarmament. The objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons is at the core of Australia's policy. We believe that the strategic environment is such that it is now possible to map out concrete steps in order to achieve a world without nuclear weapons.

In view of our strong commitment to nuclear disarmament, we regret that we were unable to support this

draft resolution. While the draft resolution deals comprehensively with development, production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons, the lack of any reference to non-proliferation, and specifically to this year's decision by the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to extend the Treaty indefinitely and to commit themselves to a declaration of Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, including a reaffirmation of the goal of the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, leaves the draft resolution unbalanced. The NPT provides the only legally binding framework in which all five nuclear-weapon States are bound to the process of nuclear disarmament.

We also have difficulties with reference to the Conference on Disarmament, a body whose prime task has to remain the negotiation of multilateral agreements. In particular, to ask the Conference on Disarmament to initiate negotiations early in 1996 on a programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons could disrupt and impede the finalization of two key steps towards the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons, namely, the negotiation of the comprehensive test-ban treaty and a cut-off convention.

Ms. Kurokochi (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmamer ". Japan, with its unique past experience, honestly desires that the use of nuclear weapons, which would cause indescribable human suffering, should never be repeated. It thus attaches great importance to the efforts directed towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

By this draft resolution the General Assembly would call upon the nuclear-weapon States to undertake nuclear disarmament within a time-bound framework, but we understand that the draft resolution is not the product of coordination of the views of the countries concerned, such as the United States, the Russian Federation and other nuclear-weapon States. Japan, which seeks to promote nuclear disarmament by means of steady disarmament efforts, cannot regard the draft resolution as having been formulated on the basis of appropriate consideration and consultation. Furthermore, the draft resolution does not contain any reference to the highly important outcome of the Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, *inter alia* the decisions to extend the NPT indefinitely and to adopt the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament. Japan therefore could not support it.

Mr. Lew (Republic of Korea): The Republic of Korea abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, primarily because the text fails to refer to the results of the Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons last May, which we believe constitute the most important basis for future work on nuclear disarmament.

However, our abstention does not mean that my Government has reservations on the key thrust of the draft resolution. My delegation shares the basic rationale, importance and ultimate objectives of the draft resolution. We also believe that the highest priority in the nuclear-disarmament agenda should be given at this stage to the conclusion of the comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty and the commencement of the negotiations on the treaty banning the production of fissile material.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1.

Mr. Moher (Canada): Would it be in order for me to make a brief comment with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14, in cluster 2?

The Chairman: You may do so.

Mr. Moher (Canada): I should like to make a brief comment on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14, which deals with the status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. In doing so, I speak on behalf of the 53 co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

Canada — and Poland, with whom we have worked very closely on this draft resolution — had hoped to put forward a procedural draft resolution that encouraged the continuation of work on the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention but which recognized that a series of difficult issues are being worked on in the Preparatory Commission at The Hague. In pursuing that objective, we had an extensive series of discussions with many delegations, up to and including discussions held yesterday afternoon.

I do believe that we have made considerable progress towards finding consensus on the draft resolution, and we appreciate the efforts and the contributions made by all delegations concerned. I must admit, however, that we were, in the final analysis, not able to resolve all questions.

I am therefore intervening this morning to serve notice of withdrawal of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14. In doing so, I want to express once again Canada's deep appreciation of the support given to us by the 53 co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.14 and to emphasize our hope that developments at The Hague and in national capitals will enable us to take more positive action on this issue in the future.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to make a brief statement concerning draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14. Since the draft resolution has been withdrawn by its sponsors, I should like to inform the Committee, on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.1/50/L.54, that those amendments are not pressed for action.

Having said that, I should like to say that we had fruitful discussions on this important issue with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14, but that unfortunately, as the Ambassador of Canada pointed out, we could not resolve some of the issues. However, that should in no way interrupt the work at The Hague, and we hope that our collective efforts there will lead to the early entry into force of the Convention and the resolution of all the outstanding issues, as reported to the First Committee at the current session by the Executive Secretary of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Our amendment simply draws on the some of the elements contained in the statement by the Executive Secretary, Mr. Kenyon, and is aimed at giving a more focused direction and purpose to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14.

We will keep working to resolve outstanding issues with a view to having a draft resolution next year.

The Chairman: The Committee will now turn to cluster 3, which includes draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34.

I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the Committee's 16th meeting on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, I should like to place on record the following statement, which I make on behalf of the Secretary-General:

"By operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, the General Assembly would take note of the decision of the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects to continue its work at resumed sessions in Geneva, from 15 to 19 January 1996 and from 22 April to 3 May 1996, and it would request the Secretary-General to continue furnishing needed assistance to the Review Conference.

"In that connection, the activity called for in operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution is programmed in the proposed programme budget for the 1996-1997 biennium under section 2C.4, Disarmament. It appears under subprogramme 1, 'Deliberation and negotiation' of programme 7, 'Disarmament' of the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997 as revised, hence provision of assistance to States Parties in rendering parliamentary services as well as depositary services would be carried out within resources approved under section 2 for the biennium 1996-1997.

"It should be noted that the resumed sessions of the Review Conference are conferences of States Parties to the Convention. As was the case in the past, conferences on multilateral disarmament treaties — for example, the Sea-bed Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Environmental Modification Convention — included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the conference. Under those arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the United Nations.

"Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 to provide the necessary assistance to the Review Conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations with respect to conference servicing and associated costs which would be met under the financial arrangements to be made by the conferences of the Convention.

"Furthermore, all activities related to the international conventions or treaties that under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties in advance."

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel acceded to the inhumane weapons Convention in March of this year. In doing so, against the background of the peace process and in view of the acute humanitarian problems of anti-personnel mines, Israel felt that it was both propitious and vital to commit itself to the important elements inherent in the Convention, and in Protocol II in particular.

Israel's motivation comes from a deep and sincere concern for, and appreciation of, the need to reduce and prevent suffering and to restrict the use of weapons that have indiscriminate effects. However, we feel that it is necessary to keep the proper balance between vital humanitarian concerns on the one hand and legitimate security concerns on the other, with the aim of preventing further suffering.

Joint action by the international community to prevent suffering as a result of the indiscriminate use of mines will in itself enhance mutual trust and confidence between nations and peoples. In this context, Israel reiterates its call to the regional partners to acceded to the inhumane weapons Convention as a regional confidence-building step, for the sake of security and mutual trust and as a sign of encouragement and hope for the future. Israel believes that accession to the Convention will have a supporting role at the regional level.

Mr. Esenli (Turkey): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34.

The Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects constitutes one of the cornerstone instruments in the field of disarmament. Turkey is a signatory to that Convention. It is apparent that the last Review Conference in Vienna could not be concluded because of the continuing disagreement on the future content of Protocol II. My delegation believes, therefore, that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 can become meaningful only if and when the Review Conference completes its work in the course of the resumed sessions in Geneva, which are scheduled for January and April 1996. However, in the spirit of compromise, we joined in the consensus.

Mr. Karem (Egypt) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: On 13 October 1995, the Vienna Review Conference on the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) concluded its work without achieving any significant success towards the introduction of the proposed amendments relating to the problem of land-mines and booby traps to the second Protocol annexed to that Convention.

We can only view with regret the indecisiveness of the Review Conference, in which Egypt participated as an observer, although we have signed, but have not ratified the Convention. This indecisiveness has dashed the hopes many countries had pinned on the Conference with regard to the desired developing and strengthening of the provisions of the Convention on Conventional Weapons. The major cause for our regret and disappointment is the Conference's failure to introduce amendments that would urge the States parties to the Convention to provide assistance in mine clearance, a matter that cannot be overemphasized in view of the horrendous consequences from which innocent people continue to suffer in various parts of the world.

The Convention on Conventional Weapons is the binding international instrument that deals with the question of land-mines in all its aspects. Egypt believes that the most important of those aspects relates to the concerted action and mobilization of efforts required from the international

community towards the clearance of the land-mines planted in the soil of scores of States.

While the resolution on this Convention had called earlier for the accession of more countries to it, we maintain that it would have been more effective for the resolution to have called for the finalization, at the earliest possible opportunity, of the introduction of the proposed amendments to the Convention on Conventional Weapons. Those amendments should take into account the concerns, fears and interests of all countries without exception and accord priority to the endorsement of the amendments concerning the provision of assistance to the countries that are afflicted with the land-mines problem.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, on the Convention on certain conventional weapons.

The First Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects was convened in Vienna last September. The meeting considered seriously, and adopted, a protocol on blinding laser weapons. The meeting did not have a chance to complete its amendment to the protocol on the use of mines. However, thanks to the work of the four meetings of the Group of Experts at the current session of the General Assembly, progress was made in the negotiations. In addition, all sides gained a more profound and complete understanding of the position of others, which will be very beneficial to our future work.

China was active, serious and responsible in participating in the negotiations in Vienna, and we did our best to make compromises. China is in favour of improving the Protocol on mines. At the same time, we believe that in the process of amending the Protocol, we should try our best to achieve a balance between international military needs and humanitarian needs. What we are faced with is a complex political, military, humanitarian and legal problem. The parties to the solution of this problem have vast differences in their levels of development, security environments and other related areas. This is the reality we have to face.

China hopes that at the resumed sessions in January and April next year, all sides will be flexible and pragmatic and will enter into a spirit of compromise in resolving existing problems. We hope also that they will live up to the expectations of the international community and will achieve the greatest possible reduction in the injuries inflicted by mines on innocent civilians.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34.

The Committee will now move on to cluster 10.

The Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.43.

I call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43.

Mr. Calovski (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): I should like to make a very brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43, on "Development of good-neighbourly relations among Balkan States".

First, the sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.43 would like to propose that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. It is a consensus draft resolution which, I am sure, enjoys the approval of all delegations.

Secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43 addresses the future relations among Balkan States and the integration of all Balkan countries into Europe. For that reason, in my previous statements I have underlined the need for the Europeanization of the Balkans, and not its further Balkanization. In that most important endeavour, the development of good-neighbourly relations among all Balkan States can play the most important role.

It is fitting to note that the draft resolution has been co-sponsored by all States members of the European Union. That signifies their confidence that the aim of the draft resolution, the speedy integration of all Balkan States into Europe, is a realistic one. All Balkan States, for political, economic, cultural, social and, of course, security reasons, would like to become members of the European Union as soon as possible. I hope this stated wish and need of all Balkan States and peoples will become a reality in the not-too-distant future.

We look forward to this and also to the important report of the Secretary-General requested in operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43.

The Chairman: No other delegation has asked to make a statement before action is taken on the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43, entitled "Development of good-neighbourly relations among Balkan States", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on any representatives who wish to make a statement on the action just taken.

Mr. Bandura (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): I am speaking in order to thank all delegations for supporting draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, which was adopted today without a vote.

From the very first day of the proclamation of its independence, Ukraine has carried out a very consistent policy in the area of nuclear disarmament, having proclaimed its renunciation of nuclear weapons in its declaration of State sovereignty, even before the collapse of the former Soviet Union. We fully support the idea of the achievement of general and complete nuclear disarmament.

We are most gratified that these steps, as well as those of other newly-independent States, such as Belarus and Kazakstan, have been appropriately assessed today by the First Committee. This attests to the positive changes that have taken place in the world since the end of the cold war, and to the possibility of building, in the next century, a world without nuclear weapons.

I should like also to emphasize that the unwavering and consistent policy of my country has played a significant role in assuring that no new nuclear States have emerged on the map of the world.

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform representatives that this afternoon the Committee will proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions listed in the following clusters:

In cluster 1: the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3;

In cluster 8: the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.13 and its amendments, which are contained in document A/C.1/50/L.53; and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48;

In cluster 7: A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1. Revision 1 will be available to all delegations this afternoon.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): There will be a meeting of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42: "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements" at 3 p.m. today in conference room C.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.